

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 4, 2010, and the Advisory Action mailed October 6, 2010.

In the Advisory Action mailed October 6, 2010, it was indicated that the amendment filed by Applicant on September 25, 2010 would not be entered since it raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendment filed by Applicant on September 25, 2010 not be entered, and that the amendment currently enclosed herewith be entered instead.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 4, 2010, Claims 1-5, 9, 12-17, 34-38, 42, 45-55, 59, 62-67, 69-71, 73 and 74 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 9, 13-17, 34-37, 42, 46-54, 59, 62-67, 69-71, 73 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutsch et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0034771 hereinafter Hutsch). Claims 5, 38 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0056026). Claims 12 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch in view of Hoffman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0069766 hereinafter Hoffman).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1-2, 34-35, 51-52, 73-74, cancels Claims 9, 42, 59, and adds new Claims 75-77, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-5, 12-17, 34-38, 45-55, 62-67, 69-71, and 73-77.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 9, 13-17, 34-37, 42, 46-54, 59, 62-67, 69-71, 73 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutsch. Claims 5, 38 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch in view of Anuff. Claims 12 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch in view of Hoffman.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following:

1. *(Currently Amended) An interactive tool that can configure a portal, comprising:
a first user interface operable to at least one of define and manage the portal, wherein the portal provides access to content in a virtual content repository (VCR), wherein the VCR is a hierarchical representation of a plurality of individual content repositories such that the plurality of individual content repositories appear and behave as a single content repository, and wherein the portal is associated with a plurality of portal components and the first user interface uses a hierarchy to manage the plurality of portal components; and
a second user interface operable to at least one of define and manage entitlement for said plurality of portal components, wherein each different portal components in said plurality of portal components can be associated with a different set of roles, and each different role in said different set of roles can be entitled with a different set of entitlement capabilities, wherein the second user interface allows a user to select a role from a set of roles for a portal component in said plurality of portal components, and the second user interface further allows the user to select different entitlement capabilities from a set of entitlement capabilities for said role selected by the user for said portal component;
wherein the interactive tool runs on at least one processor.*

Hutsch discloses a network portal system that includes a web-top manager and a universal content broker system (Abstract). Hutsch further discloses that configuration server includes system configuration, policies, and/or device-specific settings, which means that various user roles with different access rights to system resources can be defined (Paragraph [0324]).

However, each user role in Hutsch is associated with a pre-defined, or fixed, access rights to system resources, whereas the second user interface, as embodied in Claim 1, further allows a user to select different entitlement capabilities from a set of entitlement capabilities for a role that is selected by the user for a portal component. In other words, as embodied in Claim 1, the entitlement capabilities for a role can be changed by a user through the second user interface.

Additionally, Anuff discloses a portal server that presents an HTML page that comprises a plurality of modules that are formatted in a predetermined layout (Abstract). Hoffman discloses a hierarchy management feature that allows a hierarchy node to be dragged and dropped to another node in the hierarchy (Paragraph [1032] and [1038]).

However, there is no indication in Anuff and Hoffman that a user interface allows a user to select different entitlement capabilities from a set of entitlement capabilities for a role that is selected by the user for a portal component.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 34 and 51

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 34 and 51 have been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 34 and 51, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination with other claims. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 12-17, 35-38, 45-50, 52-55, 62-67, 69-71, and 73-74

Claims 2-5, 12-17, 35-38, 45-50, 52-55, 62-67, 69-71, and 73-74 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 34 and 51. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Additional Amendments

Claims 75-77 have been newly added by the present Reply. Subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 75-77 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed herewith is a Petition for Extension of time, together with the appropriate fee, extending the time to respond up to and including December 4, 2010.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2010

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928